

# **Exhibit F**

Case3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document317 Filed08/17/11 Page1 of 4

1 KEKER & VAN NEST LLP  
2 ROBERT A. VAN NEST - #84065  
3 rvannest@kvn.com  
4 CHRISTA M. ANDERSON - #184325  
5 canderson@kvn.com  
6 633 Battery Street  
7 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
8 Telephone: 415.391.5400  
9 Facsimile: 415.397.7188

10 KING & SPALDING LLP  
11 SCOTT T. WEINGAERTNER (*Pro Hac  
12 Vice*)  
13 sweingaertner@kslaw.com  
14 ROBERT F. PERRY  
15 rberry@kslaw.com  
16 BRUCE W. BABER (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
17 1185 Avenue of the Americas  
18 New York, NY 10036  
19 Tel: 212.556.2100  
20 Fax: 212.556.2222

21 Attorneys for Defendant  
22 GOOGLE INC.

23 KING & SPALDING LLP  
24 DONALD F. ZIMMER, JR. - #112279  
25 fzimmer@kslaw.com  
26 CHERYL A. SABNIS - #224323  
27 csabnis@kslaw.com  
28 101 Second St., Suite 2300  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel: 415.318.1200  
Fax: 415.318.1300

29 IAN C. BALLON - #141819  
30 ballon@gtlaw.com  
31 HEATHER MEEKER - #172148  
32 meekerh@gtlaw.com  
33 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
34 1900 University Avenue  
35 East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
36 Tel: 650.328.8500  
37 Fax: 650.328-8508

38 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

39 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

40 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

41 ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,

42 Plaintiff,

43 v.

44 GOOGLE INC.,

45 Defendant.

46 Case No. 3:10-cv-03561-WHA

47 **CORRECTED DECLARATION OF  
48 KRISTIN ZMRHAL CONCERNING THE  
49 AUGUST 6, 2010 EMAIL AND DRAFTS  
50 THEREOF**

51 Judge: Hon. Donna M. Ryu

52 Date Comp. Filed: October 27, 2010

53 Trial Date: October 31, 2011

54 CORRECTED DECLARATION OF KRISTIN ZMRHAL CONCERNING THE AUGUST 6, 2010 EMAIL AND  
55 DRAFTS THEREOF  
56 CASE NO. 3:10-cv-03561-WHA

Case3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document317 Filed08/17/11 Page2 of 4

1           I, Kristin Zmrhal, state:

2           1. I have been employed since January 2011 by defendant Google Inc. as a Project  
 3 Manager of Discovery Support. I submit this declaration to provide factual information  
 4 regarding (a) the “auto-save” function of Google’s email service (“Gmail”), and (b) Google’s  
 5 document collection and review procedures in this case. I understand that this information  
 6 relates to Tim Lindholm’s August 6, 2010 email and drafts thereof, which are the subject of a  
 7 pending motion to compel in this case.

8           2. Except where I have stated facts on information and belief, I have knowledge of  
 9 the facts set forth herein, and if called to testify as a witness thereto could do so competently  
 10 under oath.

11           3. Gmail has an “auto-save” function that automatically saves a user’s draft email as  
 12 the email is being written. On information and belief, the auto-save function takes a snapshot of  
 13 the user’s draft email every 10-60 seconds and saves those snapshots to the user’s “Drafts”  
 14 folder. No user action is required to create or save an auto-saved draft of an email.

15           4. I manage a team of Google in-house discovery paralegals and legal assistants that  
 16 are responsible for document collection in this case. Google’s in-house attorneys and litigation  
 17 paralegals have provided me and my team with a list of 86 document custodians for this case.

18           5. I or a member of my team input each custodian’s username into a computer  
 19 script. The script harvests Gmail messages (and drafts thereof) from Google’s backend email  
 20 system. The script creates electronic copies of all unique messages associated with the user’s  
 21 email account and transfers those copies to a separate server that can only be accessed by my  
 22 discovery team. My team then downloads the custodial email onto an encrypted hard drive and  
 23 delivers that hard drive to a third-party vendor for processing.

24           6. The Google in-house discovery and litigation paralegals have collected and  
 25 delivered to the third-party vendor over 97 million documents for this case.

26           7. The third-party vendor processes the documents. The vendor electronically  
 27 indexes the documents and filters out plainly irrelevant documents by applying search terms  
 28 agreed upon by Google and Oracle America, Inc. (“Oracle”). The vendor then uploads the

1 filtered documents to an online review database for manual review.

2       8.     The online review database allows users to view documents on a computer screen.  
3     Users can access the database via the internet and electronically “tag” documents as, for  
4     example, “responsive,” “privileged,” or “confidential.” The database software allows users to  
5     sort and organize documents according to their tags and place them into a set for production.

6       9.     Google uses a different third-party vendor to assist with the document review  
7     process. That third-party vendor’s contract attorneys review the documents on the online review  
8     database. The vendor’s contract attorneys review documents at an offsite facility. Google also  
9     employs its own contract attorneys to review documents on the online review database.

10      10.    Google’s outside counsel supervises the review process. Counsel gives to all  
11    contract attorneys a memorandum explaining the issues in the case. The memorandum provides  
12    guidance on how the contract attorneys should determine whether a document is “privileged,”  
13    “confidential,” or “highly confidential.” For example, to determine whether a document is  
14    privileged, the memorandum instructs reviewers to look for phrases such as “privileged and  
15    confidential” or “attorney work product” in the text of the email. The memorandum also  
16    includes a list of in-house and outside counsel, and instructs the reviewers to look for those  
17    names in the document to determine whether that document is privileged.

18      11.    A draft email that does not contain phrases such as “privileged and confidential”  
19    or “attorney work product” and that has no names listed in the “to” or “from” fields likely would  
20    not be tagged as “privileged.”

21      12.    To date, the contract attorneys have reviewed over 11 million documents on the  
22    online review database. Due to the sheer volume of documents that hit on an agreed upon search  
23    term and were uploaded to the online database for review, Google’s in-house and outside counsel  
24    are not able to re-review for accuracy every document tagged by a contract attorney. Instead,  
25    counsel rely on electronic screening mechanisms to check the quality of the contract attorneys’  
26    review. These screening mechanisms—referred to as “analytics”—are designed to identify, for  
27    example, potentially privileged documents that should have been tagged as “privileged” on  
28    initial review by a contract attorney. The analytic can identify potentially privileged documents

Case 3:10-cv-03561-WHA Document 317 Filed 08/17/11 Page 4 of 4

1 and group them together into a set to be re-reviewed by a contract attorney before production.

2 13. One analytic that Google's outside counsel used to identify potentially privileged  
3 documents in this case was to search for email containing phrases like "privileged and  
4 confidential" or "attorney work product" in the text of the email or an attorney's name in the "to"  
5 or "from" field of the email. An email not containing those phrases in the body or an attorney's  
6 name in the address fields would not be identified by that analytic and, if tagged by a contract  
7 attorney as responsive, would be produced.

8 14. Google has produced over 3.7 million documents in this case. Google's 60  
9 separate document productions span almost 19 million pages.

10 15. On information and belief, I understand that eight auto-saved drafts of Mr.  
11 Lindholm's August 6, 2010 email were inadvertently produced in this case. Unlike the final  
12 email that Mr. Lindholm sent, none of those eight drafts contain the phrases "Attorney Work  
13 Product" or "Google Confidential." And unlike the final email that Mr. Lindholm sent, none of  
14 those drafts contain any recipient in the "to" field, let alone an attorney recipient. I also  
15 understand that a ninth draft of that email is listed on Google's privilege log as entry 5512. That  
16 draft includes the phrases "Attorney Work Product" and "Google Confidential" in the body, and  
17 the character "a" in the "to" field.

18 16. On information and belief, I understand that the final August 6, 2010 email from  
19 Tim Lindholm appears two times on Google's privilege log as entries 2551 and 5513 and that  
20 one copy of it has been submitted *in camera* to the Court.

21  
22 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing facts are true and correct.

23 Executed on 8/14/2011.

24  
25  
26   
Kristin Zmrhal

27  
28